

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/768,225	01/30/2004		Michael J. Mikich	HYLOFT03-05CIP	6213	
52396	7590	11/17/2005		EXAMINER		
		FIRM, LLC HES PARKWAY	CHEN, JOSE V			
SUITE 850	ARD HOO	HES FARRWAT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LAS VEGA	S, NV 8	9109		3637		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	:	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10/768,225	MIKICH ET AL.	
Office Action S	Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		José V. Chen	3637	
	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addre	ess
Period for Reply	:			
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mail	FROM THE MAILING DA under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 ing date of this communication. ove, the maximum statutory period we need period for reply will, by statute, than three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMU 36(a). In no event, however, may will apply and will expire SIX (6) N cause the application to become	r a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this commendate of the comment of the	
Status				
1) Responsive to comm	unication(s) filed on <u>29 Ju</u>	ıly 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL.	<u> </u>	action is non-final.	,	
<i>′</i> —			atters, prosecution as to the m	erits is
<i>'</i> —	with the practice under E	·	• •	
D: ''' (A) '			:	
Disposition of Claims	; ; ;			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are p	ending in the application.			
•	n(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are	:	€		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-18,20-</u>	<u>29,31-38,40 and 41</u> is/are	e rejected.	t .	
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7, 19, 30, 39</u>	is/are objected to.	;	• •	
8) Claim(s) are su	ubject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers		,	•	
		:		
9) The specification is ob	· .		to butho Evenines	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on	· :		-	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	4 40474)
,	· ' '	•	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	
The bath of declaration		alliller. Note the attack	ned Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	:			
12) Acknowledgment is m	ade of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	: :		
1. Certified copies	of the priority documents	s have been received.	:	
2. Certified copies	of the priority documents	s have been received in	Application No	
3. Copies of the c	ertified copies of the prior	ity documents have be	en received in this National Sta	age
application fron	n the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detail	ed Office action for a list	of the certified copies n	ot received.	
			•	
Attachment(s)		🗖		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO Notice of Draftsperson's Patent D 			w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statemen Paper No(s)/Mail Date			of Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)
1	:	, —		

Application/Control Number: 10/768,225

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-29, 31-38, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrison in view of Griswold. The patent to Morrison teaches structure substantially as claimed including a platform (90) comprising one or more individual panels, support frame comprising a support beam (70) subjacent the platform, two suspension posts (28, 50) that is vertically adjustable, a fastener (20), the only difference being that the panels do not form a continuous surface. However, the patent to Griswold teaches the use of providing a continuous surface as a platform formed of individual panels to be old. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify the structure of Morrison to include a platform of continuous panels, as taught by

Application/Control Number: 10/768,225

Art Unit: 3637

Griswold since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 19, 30, 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3637

Chen/jvc 11-14-05 Application/Control Number: 10/768,225

Art Unit: 3637

Page 5